

or with his dependence on anybody except the virtual owners of the Canal. Long before the Viceroy found himself so hard-pressed for money that he was driven to bring his shares into the market, he had in hand several adventurous projects for the extension of his dominions. The expedition up the Nile Valley as far as the Great Lakes and the annexation of Darfur have attracted the greatest amount of attention in this country, but the fact that a similar movement has been contemplated both on Abyssinia and on the Sultan of Zanzibar was not so well known. The feelings of hostility with which Egypt has always looked upon Abyssinia were whetted by the prospect of easy plunder that was opened up when the British Army took Magdala by storm, and, according to Mr. Disraeli, "planted the standard of St. George on the mountains of Rasselas." Indeed, it was a matter of astonishment to many that we have had to wait so long for the news of a breach between Egypt and Abyssinia. But the news that our very good friend and ally, and recent guest, the Sultan of Zanzibar, has fallen into the grasp of the same destiny is more astonishing, for we were not aware that the Egyptians had at present any intention or desire of reducing to submission the wild Somali tribes who lie between Abyssinia and Zanzibar until, at any rate, they had eaten up the former country. However, both aggressions have taken place—the one was expected, the other unexpected; but as to neither was any fixed policy struck out when the British Government lately purchased the Khedive's Canal Shares. It is quite certain nevertheless that the attack of the Khedive on the Abyssinians would not have been interfered with any more than the expeditions of "Baker Pasha" and Colonel Gordon if we had not accepted a stake, in some indefinite but operative way, in the prosperity and security of Egypt. Lord Derby last week was unable to explain to the Anti-Slavery deputation precisely what our interest and authority in Egypt were, but this week he has found out the extent of his tether, and has, according to a telegram received on Thursday by a City house interested in Egyptian finance, put a strong pressure on the Government at Cairo. "At the demand," says this despatch, "of the English Government the Egyptian ships have been recalled from Zanzibar, and the expedition to Abyssinia will be confined to the exaction of satisfaction, or even to a military demonstration; after which the Egyptian army will return." Here, plainly, Lord Derby has exerted over the Egyptian Government a power which he did not possess, or at least would not have attempted to use before the purchase of the Canal Shares. We do not contend that Lord Derby was not right in using it in the present instance, but the immense responsibilities that the acceptance of such an authority carries with it cannot be ignored. Whatever diplomacy may say, the world in general will believe henceforward that England can and does control at least the foreign policy of Egypt, and that if we allow the Egyptians to make any further African conquests after having shown now that we are able to restrain them, we do so with a view to our own ultimate gain.

Such a feeling, it must be admitted, would not be helpful to this country, which is already supposed to cherish notions of extra-European aggrandisement that are deeply distasteful to foreign countries. We can only show clean hands by prohibiting the Khedive from everything that looks like aggression, and if we say we cannot do this our foreign critics can point with an appearance of justice to the influence that the British Government has already, as Thursday's telegram testifies, exerted at Cairo. Yet such a report, we may urge, would not be of universal application; the Khedive just now, gratified with the unwonted enjoyment of "drawing on Rothschild at sight," is in a yielding mood, but at another time his blood may be up on finding that he is not likely to get any more money from England, he may not be very well disposed to oblige Downing Street; and if he asserts that no matter who holds the Canal Shares, he has a perfect right to march upon the Equator, and

beyond it, and to trample down all people that he finds in his way, how can we gainsay him? There is only one argument to which men like Ismail of Egypt are accessible, and that is the threat or the actual touch of force. But that argument does not for the present find a place in our policy towards the Egyptian Government. We have nothing to do, therefore, but to take the Khedive's promises of moderation and other Christian virtues at what they are worth, or to tolerate the breach of them if, when the Abyssinians resist, he should cast aside his pledges. The Moslem policy and the Moslem temper are, after all, summed up in the verse "Ye shall make no pact with the infidel, but shall smite his soul to hell." Nothing but a superior power will restrain their fierce faces within the bounds of tolerance and peace. But the general intensity of Moslem fanaticism is sharpened in the relations of Egypt with Abyssinia by a long struggle in which the Christians were gradually driven to the south from the Nile and inland from the Red Sea. The Turks of Egypt, however, have not been uniformly successful in their warfare with the Abyssinians, and they have never forgotten or forgiven their defeat. When Theodore fell they hoped that the whole country would speedily fall into utter anarchy, and that then they would easily annex it. But, contrary to general expectation, the Prince of Tigré succeeded, soon after the departure of Lord Napier's army, in securing a sort of supremacy over the whole of Abyssinia. In 1872 he was recognised by the English Foreign Office as King Johannes, and in the following year he addressed letters to Lord Granville, complaining of Egyptian encroachments. M. de Cosson, a French traveller, who had an interview with King Johannes in 1873, in which the king repeated his complaints of the Egyptian attacks, apparently with the ignorant hope of obtaining an intervention of the European Powers, and especially of England, on his behalf. It is needless to say that no intervention was practicable. The Egyptians steadily pushed forward on the frontier, but did not find it so easy to break down the Abyssinian resistance. Accordingly, a couple of months ago, the Khedive, as a friendly letter from Alexandria says, resolved "to end the matter," "to protect his rights, and to bring Abyssinia to reason" at the point of the bayonet. An army of 2,000 men, armed with Remington rifles, and in part commanded by European officers, marched inland from Massowah. They encountered some ten days' march from the Red Sea port the main army of King Johannes, whose 30,000 men—the numbers, of course, are wildly conjectural—were led by an Englishman, General Kirkman. The Egyptians were defeated with immense loss, including their Danish commander, Arendroop Pasha, and retreated to Massowah. A new expedition to avenge the disaster was instantly organised at Cairo, and on this will probably be spent much of the money paid for the Canal Shares. It is to have trained soldiers, European and American officers, the newest artillery, and small arms. Such at least was the determination of the Khedive before Lord Derby's advice was interposed. Now we hear only of moderately reasonable defensive projects. But the causes of quarrel are permanent, and the Abyssinians, elated by their victory, are not likely to leave the Egyptians without pretexts for war.

ENGLISHMEN IN INDIA.

The ways by which the English obtained possession of India will not all bear examination, and our administration cannot even yet pretend to be faultless, but there can be no doubt that as a nation England has shown a greater capacity for ruling foreign dependencies than any other modern European Power. England has succeeded in a large measure to the governing faculty of Rome; no other people have shown the same ability to keep what they have got. If we compare the policy of these great imperial states, and look for the secret of their respective empires, we find one

striking difference—that Rome ruled with an iron hand, whereas Britain's policy has been to adapt herself to the native institutions of her subjects, and interpenetrate these with higher notions of just and impartial government. A wise conformity to native tastes and institutions has been a distinguishing characteristic of English rule in India. There have been many exceptions to this on the part of individuals. A recent traveller in India tells a story of an English railway-porter at Calcutta, who, seeing a Brahman hesitating to enter a carriage filled with persons of an inferior caste, just as the train began to move, bundled him unceremoniously into the carriage with the impatient remark, "To 'ell with your caste!" This man, as Mr. Grant Duff observes, was all unconsciously a great social reformer in his way, and no doubt, since we came into possession of India, the caste system has received many similar lessons. But, though native prejudices have been ruthlessly shocked and trodden under foot by the heedlessness and ignorance of individuals, often with good results, often with no result but the wanton infliction of pain, on the whole the animating principle of our government has been of a totally opposite character.

Natives smarting under the insolence of the rougher sort of our countrymen would probably consider it a paradox, but it may be doubted whether our tolerant willingness to conform in India has not been carried to the point of timidity and weakness. This reflection is inevitably raised by the account published this week in the *Daily News* of the brutal sports at which the Prince of Wales was present at Baroda. When the news was first telegraphed that the Prince had been a spectator of fights between elephants, rhinoceroses, buffaloes, and rams, a correspondent in these columns drew attention to the usual nature of these spectacles, as depicted in a book of which the Prince has been distributing copies among the native chiefs as presents, but now we have before us a graphic detail of what actually took place at Baroda. The Prince of Wales has gone to India as the representative of the English people; his presence at such an exhibition carries with it the sanction of the English people; and the question arises whether the exhibition is such as the English people desire to be made responsible for by their ceremonial representative. It began with a duel between elephants. There was little excitement in that; the brutes, as the *Daily News* Correspondent says, understood each other, butted with their foreheads, clashed their tusks, and intertwined their trunks, as harmlessly as two human sparrers with their gloves on. But this bloodless sport by no means satisfied the spectators; clamps were put on the hind legs of the beasts to keep them from running away, and fuses were fired under them as a stimulus to action. Still no blood was drawn; and a combat between two rhinoceroses was equally harmless. "Neither had much stomach for the fray, and the short struggle ended in the incontinent and cowardly bolting of the larger short-horned brute with clumsy bounds and frisks, obvious 'funk,' and profuse gruntings." They were brought to the scratch again; water was poured over them, but only with the result of making them bolt in opposite directions. Then their thick hides were "prodded" with spears, but they could not be brought to fight—they only floundered grotesquely and grunted round the arena as far from each other as possible. Neither elephant nor rhinoceros could be got to shed a fellow-creature's blood for the amusement of the higher orders. But the next combatants brought into the arena showed more spirit. We quote from the *Daily News* its Correspondent's graphic account of what followed:—

Buffaloes succeed behemoth; genuine wild buffaloes of the swampy jungle—brutes that among their native bulrushes will fearlessly face the tiger himself. One is black and sleek, the other dun and rough. There is no question about their ardour for the battle; with straining sinew they rush to the encounter. At the first crash the dun loses a horn close to the scalp. The agony must be horrible; the blood streams from the raw pith on to the sand, but the fighting demon is rampant in the dun, and he battles madly

on. But he cannot sustain the unequal contest long, and it is a relief from the sickening spectacle when he wheels, and, dashing blindly against the barricade, half staggers, half crouches under it, and is lost sight of as, mad with pain and terror, he rushes out into the open, the scared populace flying wildly from his infuriated track. A fresh pair take the field, and crash together, head against head, with a terrible impetus. They lock together, they struggle and strain amidst a whirlwind of sand, till at length, with a mighty heave, the smaller one throws the latter clean on to his back, and strives hard to rip open with his horn the stomach of his prostrate antagonist. But that they are parted, straining fiercely at each other as they are dragged away, this struggle would have been unto the death. A series of combats between rams ensue. These dash furiously against each other—forehead clashing on forehead—till the arena rings again with the sound of the impacts. The spectacle, which was perhaps unduly prolonged, and which was barbarous in so far as the combats were serious, and somewhat childish as well as barbarous in so far as they were make-belief, concluded with a promenade of black-bucks and nhl-ghaies, harnessed into cars, and a trumpety show of parrots and cockatoos displayed in cages by bearers ranged in a semicircle in front of the Royal balcony.

It is several thousand years since the two great divisions of the Indo-European family parted company, and now that they have been brought again into contact, there must be much that they have to learn from each other in the results of their different experiences in the interval. It would be a mistake if we who consider ourselves the superior division of the family, should obstinately shut our eyes to all that the natives of India have to teach us; and perhaps we have been wrong in banishing brutal sports, in some of their developments at least, to the offscourings of society. But unless we mean to re-establish bull-baiting and cock-fighting as fashionable amusements, the Prince of Wales, as the representative of the English people in India, committed a grave blunder when he gave his countenance to the sickening atrocities of buffalo-fighting at Baroda. He was no doubt placed in a position of great temptation if he had any curiosity to see what wild-beast fighting was like. But unfortunately he cannot, "as unvalued persons do," indulge his curiosity *incognito*, like a respectable paterfamilias from the country who goes on the sly to have a peep at the Alhambra ballet. Whether he ought to have gone in state to such an exhibition is a question that must have been decided by his advisers, and we cannot but regard it as a serious blunder, unless the English people as a whole are to relapse into what they have discarded as barbarism. It is carrying conformity to Eastern tastes too far, if we have really made up our minds that the lust for the bloody combats and dying agonies of the arena is brutal and savage, and if we are not prepared to learn that it is a pitch of civilised refinement from which we have fallen, against which we have conceived an unreasonable disgust, and towards which we must retrace our steps. Educated Hindoos know very well that such sports are not permitted in England, and the Prince's presence at Baroda will afford them an opportunity for scoffing at the English hypocrisy that throws off its thin veneer of civilisation, and returns to its wallowing in brutality the moment it is out of sight of its own strait-laced shores. If the Prince of Wales, when he was invited to the bloody entertainment, had replied in the words of the Calcutta porter, "To 'ell with your sports!" he might have played a less popular part, but he would have represented more faithfully the feeling of the English people.

There is another point in which we venture to think that our Government has shown an unwise conformity to native customs, although upon that there is room for more difference of opinion. It has been the custom in India, when one Royal personage paid a visit to another, for the two to interchange presents. The interchange meant more than a ceremony of friendship; it has long been understood and acted upon as a reciprocal contribution towards each other's expenses, there being no discourtesy involved in converting them, when necessary, into hard cash. It is a graceful custom, perhaps, but it is practically foolish, because it is difficult always to have the respective presents of equal value, and even Oriental bosoms can harbour suspicions of shabbiness. There was no reason in the world why the Prince of

Wales, going in an exceptional manner as the representative of the English people, should not have shown the natives that the custom was un-English. European sovereigns do not interchange presents in this way when they visit one another; and although our Viceroy has followed the Oriental custom, there was no reason why the Prince of Wales should not follow the European. If the native Princes had been given to understand that the Prince of Wales would neither give nor accept presents, he would have been taking a dignified course which could not have been misconceived in India, and which might have avoided not a little embarrassment and possibly ill-feeling in native Courts. At any rate it would have saved the country from what cannot but humiliate it in native eyes, the ill-judged complaints of the favourite chronicler and Under-Secretary of the expedition, that the Prince's allowance is too small. The Correspondent of the *Times* last week raised a significant cry that the sum voted for presents has proved too small, that the Prince has spent a large portion of it already when his journey is barely begun, and that he wishes to keep some of the return presents as his own private property. Such a complaint, coming from a source which cannot but be regarded as semi-official, from a man so near the Prince that, in his reports to the *Times*, he speaks of "we" as being attended by the lords-in-waiting, is not calculated to raise either the Prince or his country in the eyes of the natives. It might have been avoided if the Government had had the courage from the first to break through a foolish custom. Both in this and in the clearer case of the Baroda sports, the advisers of the expedition have erred on the side of over-conformity, and there is the less excuse for their conduct because they might have infringed custom without doing any violence to native feeling. If the object of the expedition was to bring India and England into closer contact, the opportunity might have been taken to give India some of the benefits of our experience.

LIBERAL UNITY.

Lord Hartington's speech at Sheffield confirms the favourable impression produced by his review of the Government at the close of last Session, and his recent speech at Bristol. However much ardent Reformers may be dissatisfied with his lukewarm moderation, all must admit that he is displaying great ability as Leader of the Opposition, and his success must be all the more gratifying to him that, both among friends and among foes, it was more or less unlooked for. If he had been speaking on the eve of a general election, or with a Parliamentary majority at his back, objection might fairly have been taken to his exceeding indefiniteness in regard to the future "platform" of the Liberal party; but although he hesitates as yet to commit himself to any platform, he has expressed a very clear and distinct policy, which is probably the best that could be adopted under the circumstances. At any rate, whether it is the best or not, it is the only policy at present possible, and as it is intelligible and sensible enough, it is well to have it definitely understood. The offices of Leader of the Opposition and Leader of the Liberal party involve two distinct functions. Lord Hartington is two leaders in one. The first of his functions he is discharging admirably; all the more effectively that in his criticisms of the Government he abstains with the wisdom of a strong man in possession of a good case from any approach to exaggeration, and trusts solely to the influence of unimpeachable facts placed in a powerful light. As leader of his party, a side of his two-fold office that calls for the exercise of a different kind of good sense, Lord Hartington has virtually accepted the definition of his duties which was recently given by Sir Wilfrid Lawson. He has acknowledged that the agitators, the men who are deeply convinced of the utility of certain reforms, and eager to impress them on the country, are

in one sense the real leaders of the reforming party; they are the men who give the impulse, and the nominal leader only puts himself at the head of his party in reforming work when the agitators have succeeded in impressing the bulk of the party with their convictions, and it remains to put their convictions on the statute-book. The leader of a party who accepts that view of his duties deliberately, for the time being, makes himself a reforming nonentity; his office as party-leader is deliberately held in a state of suspended animation till occasion arises for his active services. Not only is there room in the Liberal party for such an official, and propriety in applying to him the name of leader, but a leader of this sort is necessary as well as leaders in the sense of men who take an active part in the propagation of Liberal opinions. When the so-called leader of the party commits himself to a particular cause the action is more or less symbolical and ceremonial; he judges of the extent to which an idea has taken hold of the bulk of the party, and when he declares for it he implies that in his judgment the bulk of the party is ready for active operations.

The position which Lord Hartington has taken up may very easily be misrepresented by those who wax joyful over the apparent disunion of the Liberal party, but to those who are content to accept the plain meaning of his words there is no antagonism whatsoever between the views expressed at Sheffield and the proceedings, on the same day, of the National Reform Union at Manchester. On the contrary, the Radicals at Manchester, the gathering of crocheteers or whatever they may be called, were doing the very thing that the chosen head of the Moderate Liberals has been recommending. There is nothing in their doings to discourage the belief that Liberals can be united "for the purposes of political party and Parliamentary organisation," when the time comes for that union. What is the good of their being more united than they are at present, so long as the Conservatives command an overwhelming majority in Parliament? The very occasion on which Lord Hartington spoke, the mere fact that he, a moderate Whig, consented to identify his general political aims with those of a constituency which is ready to promote the return of Mr. Chamberlain, an advanced Radical, is hopeful for the united action of the party when there is anything to be gained by united action. "There is no doubt," he said quite truly, "that there exists among us a somewhat wider difference of opinion than exists among the sections of the Conservative party; but I do not know, and I cannot say, that there is any good reason why moderate Liberals should refuse to unite with those who hold far more advanced views for the purpose of accomplishing such wise and moderate reforms as they desire." True, Lord Hartington did not give any hint of the nature of the reforms for which he would at present personally be willing to co-operate with more advanced Liberals; but why at the present moment should he? It is probably better as a matter of policy that he should reserve the expression of his views of what should be done till he is in a position to know that his utterance is a sign and symbol of what the Liberal party as a whole desires. There is no necessary disorganisation involved in such a state of indecision, reflection, and preparation, if only all the nominal adherents of the party are willing to believe that the institutions of the country are still open to improvement, and are willing to go to work for their improvement when they are convinced that the proper time has arrived. Those of us who are already convinced may chafe under their inaction, but inaction for the present is a necessity, and while we are assured that their minds are not closed against persuasion, we ought to be ready to accept cheerfully the duty of making their convictions thorough. On this point Lord Hartington spoke at Sheffield with perfect good sense. "I do not think," he said, "that criticism is to be confounded at all with mutiny. Discipline, no doubt, is an essential ingredient to success in the operations of any organised body, and ardour and courage and enthusiasm are ingredients not